1. Introduction

We present a new architecture for named entity recognition. Our model employs multiple independent bidirectional LSTM units across the same input and promotes diversity among them by employing an inter-model regularization term. By distributing computation across multiple smaller LSTMs we find a reduction in the total number of parameters. We find our architecture achieves state-of-the-art performance on the CoNLL 2003 NER dataset.

4. Promoting Diversity Between LSTMs

We take the cell update recurrence parameters \mathbf{W}_i across LSTMs (we omit the c in the subscript for brevity; the index i runs across the smaller LSTMs) and for any pair we wish the following to be true:

$$\langle \operatorname{vec}(W_c^{(i)}), \operatorname{vec}(W_c^{(j)}) \rangle \approx 0$$

To achieve this we pack the vectorized parameters into a matrix:

$$\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \operatorname{vec}(W_c^{(1)}) \\ \operatorname{vec}(W_c^{(2)}) \\ \vdots \\ \operatorname{vec}(W_c^{(N)}) \end{pmatrix}$$

and apply the following regularization term to our final loss:

$$\lambda \sum_i \lVert \Phi \Phi^\top - I \rVert_F^2$$

2. LSTM and complexity

$$\mathbf{i}_{t} = \sigma(\mathbf{W}_{i}\mathbf{h}_{t-1} + \mathbf{U}_{i}\mathbf{x}_{t})
\mathbf{f}_{t} = \sigma(\mathbf{W}_{f}\mathbf{h}_{t-1} + \mathbf{U}_{f}\mathbf{x}_{t})
\mathbf{o}_{t} = \sigma(\mathbf{W}_{o}\mathbf{h}_{t-1} + \mathbf{U}_{o}\mathbf{x}_{t})
\mathbf{\tilde{c}}_{t} = \tanh(\mathbf{W}_{c}\mathbf{h}_{t-1} + \mathbf{U}_{c}\mathbf{x}_{t})
\mathbf{c}_{t} = \mathbf{f}_{t} \odot \mathbf{c}_{t-1} + \mathbf{i}_{t} \odot \mathbf{\tilde{c}}_{t}
\mathbf{h}_{t} = \mathbf{o}_{t} \odot \tanh(\mathbf{c}_{t})$$

One way of measuring the complexity of a model is through its total number of parameters. Looking at the above, we note there are two parameter matrices, \mathbf{W} and \mathbf{U} , for each of the three input gates and during cell update. If we let $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ then the total number of parameters in the model (excluding the bias terms) is $4(nm+n^2)$ which grows quadratically as n grows. Thus, increases in LSTM size can substantially increase the number of parameters.

5. Results

Model	F1	
(Chieu and Ng, 2002)	88.31	
(Florian et al., 2003)	88.76	
(Ando and Zhang, 2005)	89.31	
(Collobert et al., 2011) [‡]	89.59	
(Huang et al., 2015) [‡]	90.10	
(Chiu and Nichols, 2015) [‡]	90.77	
(Ratinov and Roth, 2009)	90.80	
(Lin and Wu, 2009)	90.90	
(Passos et al., 2014) ^{‡*}	90.90	
(Lample et al., 2016) [‡]	90.94	
(Luo et al., 2015) [‡]	91.20	
(Ma and Hovy, 2016) [‡]	91.21	
(Sato et al., 2017)	91.28	
(Chiu and Nichols, 2015) ^{‡*}	91.62	
(Peters et al., 2017) [‡] *	91.93	
This paper [‡]	91.48 ±0.22	

3. LSTM definition without biases:

To reduce the total number of parameters we split a single LSTM into multiple equally-sized smaller ones:

$$h_{k,t} = \text{LSTM}_k(h_{k,t-1}, \mathbf{x})$$

where $k \in \{1, ..., K\}$. This has the effect of dividing the total number of parameters by a constant factor. The final hidden state h_t is then a concatenation of the hidden states of the smaller LSTMS:

$$h_t = [h_{1,t}; h_{2,t}; ...; h_{K,t}]$$

6. Architecture Choices & Ablations

# RNN units	Unit size	$ F_1 $
1	1024	87.54
2	512	91.25
4	256	91.29
8	128	91.31
16	64	91.48 ± 0.22
32	32	90.60
64	16	90.79
128	8	90.41

Table 3: Performance of our model with variou unit sizes resulting in a fixed final output size *h* Single runs apart from 16 unit.

Unit size	F_1
8	89.78
16	89.77
32	90.26
64	91.48 ± 0.22
128	89.28

Table 4: Performance as a function of the unit size for our best performing model (16 biLSTM units). Single runs apart from with size 64.

Component	F_1
No character embeddings	90.39
No orthogonal regularization	90.79
No Xavier initialization	91.09
No variational dropout	91.03
Mean pool instead of concat	90.49

Table 5: Impact of various architectural decisions on our best performing model (16 biLSTM units, 64 unit size). Single runs.